UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,260	10/07/2003	Cyrielle Cheng	0513-1080	3121

466 7590 12/29/2004

YOUNG & THOMPSON
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET
2ND FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER
HOOK, JAMES F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3754	

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/679,260	**Applicant(s)** CHENG ET AL.
	Examiner James F. Hook	**Art Unit** 3754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2004.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

It is noted that the claims and abstract disclose the intermediate layer as "vinyl ethylene alcohol", the specification states it as "ethylene vinyl alcohol" which is the more recognized term. It's not clear if such was a typographical error or not, however, for the examination of the claims below, the layer will be considered to be ethylene vinyl alcohol (EVOH).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostrander in view of Fukushi and Kodama. The patent to Ostrander discloses the recited hose for transporting fluid containing hydrogen such as fuels comprising an inner layer of a fluorine based thermoplastic material such as polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) or ethylenetetrafluoroethylene (ETFE), a layer in some embodiments can be provided as a barrier layer comprised of ethylene vinyl alcohol (EVOH), and an outer layer formed of polyamides. The patent to Ostrnader discloses all of the recited structure with the exception of using EVOH in combination with fluorine based thermoplastics, where Ostrander only uses EVOH in situations where polyamides make up the inner layer, and forming the outer layer of polybutylene terephthalate (PBT). The patent to Fukushi discloses that it is known in the art to form a multilayer hose for use with fuels with an the use of PVDF and ETFE being possible for the layers and that EVOH can also be used as a barrier layer used in combination with other layers of fluorine based thermoplastics to improve the barrier properties of the hose to better block permeation of gases. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the hose in Ostrander by using the EVOH barrier layer in combination with the inner PVDF or ETFE layers as such is known in the art to provide further barrier properties and protect against permeation of gases as suggested by Fukushi to make the hose more useful. The patent to Kodama discloses the recited multilayer hose for fuel transport comprising an inner layer 1, where the inner layer can be formed of PVDF or ETFE, and the outer layer 2 outside of the inner layer and can therefore be considered an outer layer can be formed of polyamides or a polyester resin including PBT can be used in place of polyamide. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute PBT for use in the outer layer of Ostrander in place of polyamide as suggested by Kodama as such are equivalent materials used interchangeably, and where PBT would have certain beneficial qualities over the polyamide for use in specific environments and would provide different properties for use in different environments to make the hose more useful for a wider range or applications.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostrander in view of Fukushi and Kodama as applied to claims 1, 3, and 4 above, and further in view of Blasko. The patent to Ostrander as modified discloses all of the recited structure with the exception of using ethylene fluorinated ethylene propylene (EFEP) for the inner layer. The patent to Blasko discloses that it is old and well known in the art that EFEP can be used in place of ETFE interchangeably where EFEP is more melt processible. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the hose in Ostrander as modified by substituting EFEP for the other fluoropolymers used in the inner layer as suggested by Blasko as such would be more melt processible and would provide different properties for use in different environments making the hose more useful for a wider range of applications.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostrander in view of Fukushi and Kodama as applied to claims 1, 3, and 4 above, and further in view of Nishino. The patent to Ostrander as modified discloses all of the recited structure with the exception of providing a polyurethane based adhesive layer to connect the layers together. The patent to Nishino discloses that it is old and well known in the art that ETFE and PVDF can be used for hose inner layers and in order to better adhere this and other layers together in the hose, including barrier layers, a polyurethane based adhesive can be used. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the hose in Ostrander as modified by providing layers of polyurethane based adhesive to help bond layers together as suggested by Nishino as such would provide more secure connection of dissimilar layers, and would provide different properties for use in different environments making the hose more useful for a wider range of applications.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 5, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The patent to Ostrander sets forth that it carries hydrocarbons which contain hydrogen as is known in the art and therefore the layers would be a barrier to hydrogen as well, especially when the claim language is not limited to hydrogen only barriers, however, such is not persuasive in the fact that applicant has not treated the materials making up the layers to be hydrogen barriers, it merely is setting forth materials which have those properties inherently. The rejection set forth above meets the same claimed layers and inherently those layers would be able to block hydrogen molecules in the same manner as applicants when there is no modification of the plastics used in the layers of the tube that would make them able to be a barrier to hydrogen therefore such is an inherent property of the material used, which is covered by the rejection above. Therefore the added subject matter to claim 1 does not make the claims allowable over the prior art as applied above. There are no apparent arguments set forth directed toward the combination of references in regards to the rejections of 2, 5 and 6 other than those set forth in regards to the added material to claim 1, therefore there appears to be no fault found with the combination of references directed to claims 2, 5, and 6.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents Mitchell, Noone (218 and 562), Fauble, and Zimmer disclosing state of the art multi layer hoses.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James F. Hook whose telephone number is (571) 272-4903. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Wednesday, work at home Thursdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Mar can be reached on (571) 272-4906. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James F. Hook

James F. Hook
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3754

JFH